

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE LYFT INC. SECURITIES
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-cv-02690-HSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM NONDISPOSITIVE
PRETRIAL ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 168

On June 15, 2021, Plaintiff Rick Keiner filed a motion for relief from a discovery order by Magistrate Laurel Beeler concerning documents relating to reports of sexual assaults. *See* Dkt. Nos. 168 (“Mot.”), 163 (“Order”). Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, a district judge may set aside a magistrate judge’s non-dispositive pretrial order only if it is “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). “The magistrate’s factual determinations are reviewed for clear error, and the magistrate’s legal conclusions are reviewed to determine whether they are contrary to law.” *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 268 F.R.D. 344, 348 (N.D. Cal. 2010). “The Court can overturn the “magistrate’s factual determinations only if the court reaches a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.” *Id.* (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). “This standard is extremely deferential and the [m]agistrate’s rulings should be considered the final decisions of the [d]istrict [c]ourt.” *Otey v. CrowdFlower, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-05524-JST, 2013 WL 3456942, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 8, 2013) (internal quotation marks omitted) (alterations in the original).

//


//

//

1 Having reviewed Plaintiff's contentions and the relevant authority, the Court concludes
2 that Plaintiff has not shown that the Order was clearly erroneous or contrary to law and
3 accordingly **DENIES** the motion for relief.

4
5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: 9/1/2021

7 
8 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28